



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,756	04/14/2005	Martin Raubuch	SC12303EM	2224

23125 7590 05/05/2009
FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.
LAW DEPARTMENT
7700 WEST PARMER LANE MD:TX32/PL02
AUSTIN, TX 78729

EXAMINER

PARTRIDGE, WILLIAM B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2183

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

05/05/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USADOCKETING@FREESCALE.COM

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the invention as a whole, namely the novel features of the invention. Discussed the interpretations of the claims and the prior art of record. The main area of contention was that the combination of references did not perform exactly as the instant invention. Agreed that the specification admitted that performing operations as a side operation was known in the art relative to vector permutation and shifted focus to other areas. Examiner agreed that claims 28 and 29 would require further search but may contain allowable subject matter based on the specifics of the selection mechanism, specifically the details of how the counter is used in the selection. Further went on to discuss the details of the selection process in claim 1 and how it differed from the selection processes in Scales. Agreed that if the selection aspect of the invention was such a novel and key difference then the claims didn't make the differences clear enough and that Applicant's representatives would review the claim limitation and the specification to better describe the key aspect without going into the exact specifics as claim 28 had. A further search will be required but Examiner acknowledged that doing so would overcome the prior art of record and possibly lead to an allowance. No expressed agreement was reached that any of the claims as they currently stand or with amendments would be allowed.